

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0067/01 0240740
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 240740Z JAN 08
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0951
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000067

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS)
NSC FOR SMITH
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)
SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WRAP UP FOR TWO
WEEKS ENDING JANUARY 18, 2008

This is CWC-01-08

SUMMARY

¶1. (U) January 14-18 saw a gradual increase in scheduled OPCW activities following the December/January holiday period. Discussions during the French-hosted P-5 meeting seem to be an early indicator that the objectives of the P-5 States Parties for the Second Review Conference will be marked by a general desire to maintain the status quo, as opposed to proposing new initiatives.

¶2. (SBU) U.K. Ambassador Lyn Parker used the first RevCon Working Group meeting of the year to lay out the work plan for the next several months. The distribution of large sections of text at each of the next four meetings will eventually afford delegations two opportunities to review and comment on the text. In some cases, the time for review will be quite limited, indicating a need for us to have an effective clearance mechanism in place for sections as they are distributed, particularly in cases where the U.K. provides an advance copy on issues of sensitivity to the U.S.

¶3. (U) Discussions in WEOG revealed a general dissatisfaction with the lack of accountability in the International Cooperation and Assistance Division, marked most recently by a TS initiative to travel to States Parties to inspect their offers of assistance made under Article X, many of which are so general as to cause delegations to question the utility of such an undertaking. The Dutch delegation has proposed meeting in the coming weeks to discuss how contributions in general could be better coordinated, tracked and evaluated.

P-5 MEETING

¶4. (SBU) The French Ambassador hosted the P-5 (China, France, Russia, U.K., U.S.) on January 15. At the last meeting in

October, the group agreed to focus on the Review Conference at this session. There was a brief discussion of universality, the usual topic for the P-5, with general agreement that all should pursue opportunities to encourage the remaining twelve states to join the Convention, but that the time is not yet ripe for concerted joint efforts in North Korea or Middle Eastern countries.

¶15. (SBU) On the Review Conference (RevCon), U.K. Ambassador Lyn Parker, the chairman of the RevCon Open Ended Working Group (OEWG), presented an outline of the work program: weekly meetings on "chunks of draft text" for discussion with plans for a full draft text by mid-February; this will allow two rounds of discussion on the report before the next EC session in March. Parker also mentioned his intent to guide the working group through the drafting of two separate documents, as was done for the First Review Conference. The political declaration will follow after the first full draft of report language, and the two will progress in tandem as capital reviews and the second round of discussions take place. A draft agenda for the conference has been circulated, based on the First RevCon. After the meeting, Delrep asked privately who would be doing the drafting; Amb. Parker said the U.K. delegation with assistance from Ralph Trapp. The Russian delegation had previously expressed interest in a P-5 role in drafting, but the Russian Ambassador did not raise it during the meeting.

¶16. (SBU) The Chinese Ambassador noted that their domestic departments and the military are still studying the Director General's paper on the RevCon. The Chinese view is that the RevCon should plan for the next five years. The main purpose of the Convention remains destruction of chemical weapons and old and abandoned CW. This is an important issue for China since nothing has yet been destroyed there. The Chinese

Ambassador emphasized that international cooperation issues are important for the majority of countries. She described inspection mechanisms as "good" but they need to be strengthened; China "understands" the issue of OCPFs but does not feel it is yet time to shift the OPCW's focus from destruction to non-proliferation.

¶17. (SBU) China also reported on the Asian Group's deliberations for the chairmanship of the RevCon. The Saudi Ambassador is the only formal candidate. The Indian Ambassador had initially expressed interest but has not followed up; the Chinese Ambassador did not rule her out yet, though. There is no meeting scheduled yet for the Asian Group's discussion of the chairmanship. Amb. Javits raised the other leadership positions (COW, etc.) that should rotate as well. Amb. Parker said that normally, the chosen chairman would consult with each of the regional groups for their candidates; the U.K. hopes this will play out "in good time, ahead of the EC."

¶18. (SBU) The Russian Ambassador said that Moscow is also still studying the DG's paper but feels it has too much interpretation of the Convention by the TS and should be "more balanced." Amb. Javits briefed the group on U.S. objectives based on the guidance. The French Ambassador agreed with the U.S. emphases. He also noted that the DG's paper was a good stimulus for discussion and that the RevCon should be looking to the future and the role of the Convention beyond destruction of stockpiles. He raised the question of a special conference before 2012, as suggested in the DG's paper. Amb. Javits responded that the 2011 CSP will provide an opportunity to assess where we are closer to the destruction deadline and whether a special session is necessary, advising that it would be best to make the decision then. He seemed to get agreement around the table on that point.

¶19. (U) Russia will host the next P-5 meeting on March 18, specifically requesting that it take place before the RevCon.

¶10. (U) Delreps met with Milijana Danevska (Head, Protocol and Visa Branch) and Ester Borst-Kadijk (Visa Assistant) on January 16. Danevska and Borst-Kadijk discussed some difficulties that the TS has experienced recently in getting 2-year official visas for inspectors and asked for our assistance.

¶11. (U) Delreps also inquired about the procedure for updating the U.S. listing in the OPCW Directory, as we had assumed that the official list for the Conference of States Parties would be published. Danevska noted that any changes should be communicated through a note verbale to the Protocol Branch and would be updated immediately in the OPCW's electronic directory and by the next CSP in the printed directory.

WEOG MEETING

¶12. (U) There was little discussion during the first Western European and Others Group (WEOG) meeting on January 17, with Chair Annie Mari (France) and Dutch Ambassador Maarten Lak taking the lead. Mari announced that a French-sponsored seminar in Paris on the shifting balance in the OPCW would be postponed from February to 25-26 March and encouraged delegations to send participants. She noted that the seminar would be of interest to military and diplomatic experts from "the expanded WEOG, Russia, and China."

¶13. (U) Mari also announced that the meeting of the Expanded WEOG (including non-WEOG EU member states, Japan and South Korea) would take place on January 22. Amb. Lak briefly

touched on the NAM's RevCon statement that he had distributed to the WEOG and encouraged discussion of it during the Expanded WEOG meeting. He also spoke about a Dutch proposal to coordinate donor efforts, particularly in International Cooperation and Assistance. The proposal was borne out of meetings the Dutch delegation had with Amb. Mworio (Director, ICA) during which the Dutch del determined that ICA could benefit from follow-up and assessment mechanisms for its assistance programs.

¶14. (U) The Canadian del informed the WEOG that it had been approached by the TS to arrange for a "technical visit" to Canada to "confirm its offers of Article X-related assistance." Other dels (France, Germany, Portugal and the UK) also noted having received similar requests, though no one seemed to understand why the TS wanted to embark on this world-wide tour.

OEWG: PREPARATIONS FOR THE REVIEW CONFERENCE

¶15. (U) Amb. Parker (UK) chaired the first meeting of the OEWG for the year on January 17. There was good turnout but almost no discussion. Amb. Parker outlined the work program much as he had for the P-5 (see above) with a little more detail. The first round of discussion for the draft report should be completed by February 15, allowing two weeks for discussion of the full text, and then three weeks for capitals to review it. The "chunks" of draft text will be distributed at each meeting for discussion at the next one. The four pieces of text will roughly divide as follows: (1) the opening sections and universality (distributed on January 17 for discussion January 24); (2) general obligations and verification; (3) national implementation methods and activities not prohibited by the Convention; and (4) assistance and international cooperation, the Scientific Advisory Board, the functioning of the organization and final paragraphs. The precise divisions may shift a bit during the drafting. Amb. Parker noted that the key documents being used as resources for the drafting are the final report from

the first RevCon, excerpts from the DG's RevCon paper with the TS annex, and comments from all of the OEWS discussions over the past year.

¶16. (U) On procedures, Amb. Parker asked for comments on the draft agenda at next week's meeting. NGO participation will also be on the agenda. Parker said the TS will propose modalities for an NGO "event" along the lines of the first RevCon) a half day session at another venue. They are considering holding it at the OPCW headquarters to make movement back and forth to the Conference easier than the Peace Palace, which was used during the first RevCon. It would also be less expensive. Both the modalities and choice of potential participants will be open for comments next week. A related but separate issue is the participation of observers, including NGOs, at the RevCon itself. A decision on observers will be taken by the Conference itself, but Parker would appreciate early views on this matter.

¶17. (U) The French del raised the matter of ministerial-level attendance at the RevCon. Amb. Parker encouraged all delegations to let him know as soon as possible of any possible ministerial-level participation.

SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS (S&A)

¶18. (U) Delrep has worked with Bill Kane (IVB, TS) to organize a video teleconference on January 31 at 1530 local (0930 EST) for TS representatives and State and Commerce representatives in Washington. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss logistics issues that surfaced during the November 2007 routine Schedule 2 inspection in the U.S. during which S&A activities were carried out. It is expected that another such meeting will be scheduled soon to discuss the policy and other practical issues from this same

inspection.

¶19. (U) By the end of February, the TS plans to report on the outcome of the 18-month trial period for carrying out S&A activities during routine Schedule 2 inspections. Given that several delegations whose countries have hosted Schedule 2 S&A inspections (e.g., Germany and Japan) have called for an opportunity to discuss this report in an open forum, Del expects the TS to respond in some appropriate fashion. This could be done in advance and/or as part of the formal agenda of the upcoming Review Conference.

¶20. (U) Delrep has learned that the TS has taken the mandate it has received in the 2008 OPCW budget and implemented it in a way that could have a significant impact on the U.S. According to the Japanese del, Kane (IVB) has advised them to expect one or two Schedule 2 inspections during 2008 involving S&A activities. He also informed them that the U.S. will receive the same number of such inspections, and that more such inspections will occur in future years. Regarding the S&A site selection process, Kane told the Japanese del that those Schedule 2 plant sites selected for routine inspection during 2008 were reviewed to determine whether their technical characteristics warranted use of S&A during the planned inspections. The final list was tempered to give some geographical balance; Kane told the Japanese del that Japan otherwise could have received as many as four S&A inspections. Japan is anxious to build upon the discussions of the TS trial period report to determine the appropriate methodology to be used for the future integration of S&A in Schedule 2 inspections. The Japanese del has mentioned previously in their RevCon OEWS statements that they believe the TS S&A activities should be halted until a full evaluation of the TS trial period report is completed by delegations and consultations held.

OCF DECLARATION MODIFICATIONS) TS PAPER

¶21. (U) Delrep learned from Bill Kane that the TS staff has completed its technical work on its paper regarding "improvements" to the OCPF declaration requirements. The paper is now being drafted, with the goal of having it on the DG's desk for review and sign-off by the end of January. The paper includes two sets of recommendations: (1) a proposal on how product group codes (PGC) could be modified, based on existing categories in use elsewhere, to better describe the declared industries, a major goal of which is to better identify those smaller industries whose activities are of lesser relevance to the object and purpose of the Convention (and thus give those sites less consideration for inspection); and (2) a proposal on new data elements that could be added to the declaration regime that would give additional technical characteristics, the goal again being to improve the ability to better select the most relevant sites for inspection. Kane acknowledges that the first proposal is not likely to be very controversial and could possibly be implemented through a simple DG Note. However, the second proposal will likely meet significant opposition by many delegations because it increases the declaration burden for these sites. India has already expressed strong opposition to adding declaration elements to the OCPF regime, as they see it as meant to be the simplest of the declaration regimes. This second proposal, however, could lie fallow until such time as delegations see a need to consider its implementation.

UPDATE ON RUSSIAN CW DESTRUCTION

¶22. (SBU) In meeting with a representative of the Chemical Demilitarization Branch (CDB), Delrep confirmed that Russia continues to experience problems putting the incinerators at its Maradykovsky Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility into operation, particularly the largest incinerator designed to destroy reaction mass from the VX neutralization process

employed on site. The reaction mass is being stored in sealed tanks, checked regularly by the TS inspection team.

¶23. (SBU) The TS is also engaged in discussions with Russia on the facility agreement and verification plan for its destruction facility at Leonidovka. A TS visit to Moscow is tentatively scheduled for the end of January, and Russia is pressuring the TS to agree to final text in order to circulate the documents in time for consideration by the March session of the Executive Council. In confidence, the CDB officer indicated one significant point of disagreement centers on a Russian desire to receive credit for destruction prior to any mutilation or thermal processing of the munition bodies; discussions are ongoing.

¶24. (U) Javits sends.

Gallagher